DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 295 SP 014 268

AUTHOR Cross, Jack; Westbrock, Douglas
TITLE Inservice Education: The State of the Scene.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 32p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Faculty Development; *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; Sociocultural Patterns; Statistical Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

Two papers are included here, one presenting an overview of inservice education and the second presenting data on the attitudes of teachers toward inservice education in Texas. Specific concepts that have guided inservice education are focused on as well as (1) the many trends that have influenced it, (2) the objectives of the inservice programs, (3) the problems that have been encountered, and (4) the effectiveness of the programs. The second paper presents specific data results of a survey that sought to determine teacher attitudes about inservice needs. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170295

INSERVICE EDUCATION: THE STATE OF THE SCENE

Jack Cross
Professor of Education

Douglas Westbrook
Associate Professor of Education

North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack Cross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 014 268

INSERVICE EDUCATION: THE STATE OF THE SCENE

Jack Cross
Douglas Westbrook

A history teacher used to justify the study of history this way: "You don't know where you are until you know where you've been and in what direction you are pointing." Following is an analysis of where inservice education has been. This analysis presumes that inservice education takes its character from some fundamental concepts about schooling, learning and teaching, and human motivations and relationships. Edelfelt and Lawrence identified some such concepts that have been historically important in shaping inservice education. These concepts are no longer appropriate for guiding the future of education, yet because of their deep historical roots, they remain forces that leaders in inservice education must recognize.

1. The primary role of the school is the giving and receiving of information.
2. Learning is the receiving of information to be stored and used later.
3. The main business of teacher education is the quest for mastery of some relatively stable subject matters and methods of teaching.
4. Inservice education is training that is designed, planned, and conducted for the teacher by persons in authority.
5. The central purpose of inservice education is the remediation

of teachers' deficiencies in subject matter.

6. Leadership is "direction from above" and motivation is "direction from outside."
7. Teacher education in teacher preparation institutions and teacher education in schools are separate and discontinuous processes.
8. Intellectual leadership in goal setting and planning for inservice education appropriately comes from outside the school.
9. The teacher is a solo practioner (rather than a group member) involved in cooperative planning of common goals and related actions.[1]

Some of these concepts were operating at the beginning of American education or before; others emerged more recently. All are fading and being replaced, but they are fading at different rates and some are still held firmly by groups of teachers, teacher educators, and administrators.

Inservice teacher education today bears a close resemblance to the concepts that have shaped it historically. It is usually required of teachers. Content and approach are prescribed by universities and school districts. Although intentions have usually been good, too often programs are low level, piecemeal, and patchwork. Teachers achieve advanced degrees, credits for salary increments, and higher levels of certification, but the effort yields too little in the improvement of teaching or school programs. In fact, inservice education does not often deal directly with helping teachers improve their skills in

instruction or becoming more adept at planning and organizing curriculum. In school district programs, the focus is on introducing new curriculum, beefing up existing programs, or following new fads and trends, typically at the administrator's discretion. In formal graduate work, study is largely divorced from the specifics of the teacher's job.

Inservice education has been the neglected stepchild of teacher education. Most resources and effort in teacher education have gone to preservice education. For the last four decades, this concentration of resources and effort was defensible in order to assure that teachers were adequately prepared prior to service. Nearly 99 percent of the teachers currently in service have at least the bachelors degree. Meanwhile, inservice education for teachers remains a wasteland of evening, Saturday, and summer courses or workshops mandated by school districts and state departments of education. Inservice education takes place almost entirely on the teacher's time and in advance collegiate study at the teacher's expense. It is required for an advanced teaching certificate or for advancement on a local district's salary schedule. It is planned and executed by educators other than teachers. Too often it is taught in a manner that violates almost every principle of good teaching. Too little of its emphasis has been on improving teacher performance.

The sad state of affairs in inservice education today exists probably not so much by design as by neglect. For the last six decades, teacher educators have been preoccupied with improving first preservice teacher education and then graduate training for

teachers of teachers. When the degree requirements for beginning teachers was still but a dream, four years of preparation seemed reasonable to prepare a finished product. The drive to bring legitimacy to teacher education in the university may also have diverted attention from programs for teachers inservice.

Additionally, the transient nature of teaching as a profession has mitigated against inservice education efforts at the school district level. A look at a district faculty after 5 or 10 years of inservice efforts often revealed that a large percentage of teachers who were served are gone. Thus, the effects of much time, effort, and money are dissipated.

From 1960 until recently, the federal government spent millions of dollars on inservice education. Most of the funds went into National Defense Education Act and National Science Foundation institutes. Unfortunately, the institute effort suffered a fate similar to university and school district programs. The purpose was usually to improve a teachers' background in a subject or to orient a teacher to a newly developed curriculum. The institute usually picked a single teacher from a school district for a summer, a semester, or a year and planned a course of study in the tradition of the university, where most of the institutes took place. Institutes often helped a teacher become more competent in a teaching field, and some attention was given to pedagogy, particularly in the curriculum institutes. However, there was little payoff back home in terms of improved school program. One teacher alone could not change a school, even when

she or he was promoted to supervisor in a particular field. Promotion, of course, took the teacher out of teaching in the usual sense. Thus, the upgrading probably accrued more to supervisory personnel than to teachers.

As we look at the present against the background of 125 years of inservice education, Ralph Tyler says we can make a few generalizations. Much less attention is given today than in earlier times to remedying gross defeciencies in the preservice preparation of teachers. Inservice education is still viewed by many teachers as a means of increasing communication and reducing the sense of loneliness and isolation that is prevalent in an occupation in which contact with other adults is limited. Inservice education is still a major way of achieving social mobility in the education profession, not only by acquiring paper credentials that are necessary for more responsible positions and higher salaries, but also by gaining a wider visibility in the professional world. Inservice education continues to be one avenue by which an individual teacher's personal interests and needs can be served. One of the major thrusts of inservice education since 1930 is to aid the school in implementing new educational programs by helping teachers acquire understandings, skills, and attitudes essential to the roles they will play in the new programs.[2]

In sum, inservice education has been the weakest and most haphazard component of teacher education. Even the most charitable would have to admit that it has not been nearly as effective as it might have been, considering the expenditure of time, effort,

and resources. However, to say that inservice education has been inadequate is not to say that teachers can or want to do without it. During the 1974-75 school year, NEA conducted assessments of teacher needs in instruction and professional development in 18 local school districts that were representative of the country in terms of size, geographical location, types of clients served, and urban/suburban/rural setting. Inadequacy of or interest in in-service education was one of the three categories of concern to surface in every single school district. The positive conclusion to be drawn from this information is that teachers want quality inservice education; they also recognize a significant discrepancy between what exists and what they would like. Teachers want to continue to improve; they want to be current. The data also confirmed that they want changes and improvements in inservice education so that it more adequately meets their needs.[3]

The major purpose of inservice educational efforts is the improvement of instruction of students. Constant retraining in subject matter, teaching methods and attitudes is deemed essential if teachers are to keep pace with the times. Clearly, the task of improving education in schools requires improved procedures for program development, evaluation and inservice education of teachers. To accomplish this difficult task, we must help teachers and other school personnel to acquire and use new and creative teaching techniques.

Most inservice training programs are attempts to improve the quality of classroom instruction. Some programs attempt to

accomplish this goal by introducing new curricular content. The assumption here seems to be that if more up-to-date or different material is taught, the quality of instruction is improved.

Other programs are built on some theme or particular aspect of teaching, such as "individualized instruction", "improving the mental health of the classroom." The assumption of the "theme programs" may be looking at old problems in a new light, that is, by developing new concepts for analyzing teaching, we can improve the quality of instruction.

There are two important questions that can be asked of any inservice program, regardless of its origin, emphasis or point of view. First, will teachers be acting differently while teaching as a direct result of the inservice training? Second, if these changes do occur, has the quality of instruction really improved or is it just different?

People who work in inservice education sometimes feel like the small child who watched intently as her mother applied face cream. In response to the inevitable "Why?", her mother replied, "It's to make me look prettier." The youngster contemplated the removal of the cream and remarked, "Well, it didn't do any good - but I like the smell." Like the face cream, inservice education activities are currently being applied liberally throughout education, and although we can't be sure they make too much difference, we think they "smell good" enough - or have enough potential for positive change.

Part of our problem pertains to terminology: Teacher Prep-

aration, Staff Development, Inservice Education. What are they? Are they the same? Are they different? What distinguished one from the other? Historically, teacher preparation has been a series of courses which comprise a program of study for students aspiring to be teachers. The program of study is developed and provided by universities and colleges with occasional solicited suggestions from public school personnel. State department of education approve the programs and thereby grant teacher certification to students, who have completed the program in teacher education and who have received a degree. Traditionally, the university has been the primary provider of and decision maker in the preparation of teachers.

On the other hand, staff development raises images not of the university professor, but of the school administrator talking about "my staff"; teachers, counselors, principals, etc. To date the major focus of staff development efforts by system administrators has been the provision of various workshops for teachers. The workshops in "staff development" usually mean obligatory attendance for teachers after school or on a released-time day and are isolated learning experiences. The decisions in staff development are typically made by school administrators for their staff.

Inservice education is different from teacher preparation and staff development. It is neither decision making by the university nor by the school administrator, but rather mutual decision making by many parties, including representatives of participants.

Successful inservice programs require commitment by a school system of resources - time, personnel, space, and funds - to help personnel learn to do their jobs better. Decisions about what occurs, how and where as "inservice" are a result of role groups, including participants and providers, meeting together to make decisions. Control of most inservice programs becomes a shared responsibility which may include university personnel, the school system's administrators, teachers, professional association members, state department personnel, and individual consultants.[4]

Many college faculty members still act as though they believed inservice education is either "doing something to somebody" or "running something for somebody." I am reminded of a sign I used to pass on the way to the place where I often worked during the summer when I was in high school. It was a large sign, beautifully lettered, with a handsome picture in the center. It read: "Registered Hereford Bull: In-Service." "In-service" - doing it to others. The common connotations are uncomplimentary. The National Education Association and several state organizations has chosen the term "professional development" which incorporates the previous discussion of inservice education.

In recent years there has been a decided increase in emphasis on inservice education. One reason has been the declining birthrate and decline in teacher turnover. The declining birthrate and subsequent decline in student enrollment has brought the realization that there will be fewer new teachers entering the system to provide fresh ideas and points of view. There will be fewer opportunities for teachers to move to new locations, which could provide

them with a broadened or different perspective. We in education, are, in a real sense, facing the prospect of growing old together - how gracefully may depend on how well we provide for continuous professional growth through imaginative and significant inservice education programs.

Another reason is public dissatisfaction with the achievement of many students. Criticisms leveled at the schools as a result of student non-achievement in recent years have also provided a strong impetus for expanding inservice education efforts.

Lastly, there are general societal pressures that impinge on the schools. Because the schools are increasingly considered logical agents for effecting social change, they are being pressured to include more and more activities that will equip faculty members to deal with students in such a way as to alleviate or erase social ills.

There is a relatively large amount of agreement between teachers, school administrators and higher education faculty, teacher organization representatives concerning the major problems and issues in inservice teacher education. There is overwhelming agreement that inservice teacher education is important and necessary, but agreement also that it is in serious difficulty.

As student populations have stabilized in recent years, the need for new teachers has leveled off. Consequently, inservice education has replaced preservice education as the challenge in teacher education. For collegiate teacher education, inservice is both the problem and the promise as we plan the future for college of education.

Inservice education creates several problems at the collegiate level:

1. Problems with collegiate credit/degree system
2. Move to grant certificates for non-collegiate local programs
3. Power of teacher groups to control the teacher education process
4. Lack of collegiate support for field work[5]

The collegiate credit and degree system does not mesh with the perceived variable time needs of the public school teacher. The real needs of the local teachers do not fit into the college system of counting credits based on class hours. Neither do local teacher needs necessarily fit collegiate patterns of scholarship or relate directly to knowledge found in particular courses. What constitutes scholarship may not support teachers' efforts to survive and teach diverse students in the real world. Teachers and the public as well are insisting that there be some payoff for the time, energy, and cost of inservice education courses.

Graduate courses are often used to secure positions outside the classroom - as school system administrators or college professors. Encouraging classroom teachers to take graduate courses may appear counter productive to critics.

Another problem for collegiate teacher educators is that local education agencies are seeking legal responsibility to grant teachers certificates based on local programs. Local education agencies have had such authority in the past, some have it now, and others are seeking it. County operated normal schools

long were responsible for teacher training, but such preparations moved to the campus to benefit from the abundance of scholarship, competence, and service capabilities.

Without support from the organized teaching profession, there may be a widespread movement of both pre and inservice teacher education off campus. That could lead to alienation of teacher from professor and further cutbacks in persons enrolled.

As the strength of teacher organizations has grown, they have developed political clout in making decisions about teacher education. As an example, teacher organizations have negotiated conditions under which classroom teachers would supervise student teachers. Teacher groups have the power now to call the shots on inservice education. Collegiate teacher educators are in the position of serving when invited, under conditions specified by local agencies and teacher groups. This is a new kind of relationship between college and public school personnel. How the relationship works out will significantly determine the future of college teacher education.

While the growth sector of teacher education is in inservice education, collegiage patterns do not encourage professors of education to work away from the traditional on-campus role. "Non-scholarly" tasks such as working out in the field with professional teachers are not widely rewarded. Research, writing, and university committee service are more valued by promotion committees.

The higher education community will benefit from expanding the already extensive involvement of its education faculty with their colleagues in the public schools. Inservice education can't

proceed without that collaboration.

The fundamental problem with inservice education is that there has never been a broad scheme of inservice education with a clear concept of purpose, appropriate undergirding of policy, legitimancy in commitment, and fixed responsibility for attaining agreed-upon goals.

The missing dimensions of inservice education are well illustrated by contrasting inservice education with preservice teacher education. Preservice teacher education has an established framework. The responsibility for it is fixed. Institutions of higher education plan, operate, and control it. There are state level regulations to guide it and state and federal funds to finance it. Mechanisms for monitoring it, such as state approval and national accreditation, are established and operating.

By contrast, neither the college or university nor the school district has embraced inservice education as a basic commitment. State approved programs for inservice education are weak and sketchy or nonexistent. National accreditation of inservice education is largely restricted to programs in colleges and universities. In short, inservice education programs neither extend preservice frameworks nor have frameworks of their own, except in rare instances.

Time may be running out for schools of education in inservice education. If some changes in attitude and function are not made, it could be that the traditional graduate programs will go in higher education but the main action in inservice education will be handled largely outside the structure of schools

of education.

The shift away from schools of education in inservice education will not be abrupt. It will be gradual and often subtle, but little by little it will be evident that the college and university as an institution is not in the mainstream of in-service education for public school personnel.

Inservice education has long been recognized as a vital part of the educational process for the classroom teacher. The professional preparation of teachers is a continuing process, and self-renewal must occur if teachers are to stay in tune with the changing needs of their students. Effective inservice programs should help the teacher meet these changing times. A perusal of the literature, however, reveals that few research efforts have been undertaken to determine the types of inservice programs which would be most beneficial to teachers as they carry out their daily classroom duties.

Before the second half of the 1960's, research efforts in the field were meager. Reports of practices were sketchy and tended to be reported as local success stories rather than as objective descriptions.

Hermanowicz in 1966 in a study of teachers conducted in twelve states found a general dissatisfaction with inservice programs. Teachers expressed criticisms that the programs were dull and useless because they were too general, poorly timed or devoted mainly to administrative records.[6]

In a study by Schild in 1964, it was revealed that sixty-

three percent of the medium sized public school systems in the United States did not have any teachers participating in an advisory planning group for inservice education programs.[7]

In 1973, Pederson found that teachers in Kentucky perceived the greatest proficiency in those areas of responsibility for which they had the greatest involvement in inservice education.[8] Involvement is the key to successful inservice education. The shores of inservice education programs are strewn with the wrecks of ships that sailed forth with only the officers on board. The crews were left behind. Administrators must be willing to allow teachers to have the major voice in deciding what type of inservice is needed and who should conduct it.

The Texas Education Agency conducted a statewide survey of administrators and teachers during the 1972-73 school year. Fifty-nine percent of the teachers said they believed current inservice education activies met their needs "somehat", fourteen percent "to a large extent", and twenty-seven percent "not at all." After careful analysis of the questionnaire results, the Texas Education Agency indicated it would encourage districts to structure inservice education activities to meet the needs of all teachers, and through them, the needs of public school students; involve teachers in planning and evaluating teacher inservice education programs; encourage and assign classroom teachers to conduct inservice sessions when deemed appropriate; and give priority to those areas in which inservice activity is most needed, based on responses from both teachers and administrators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Edelfelt, R.A. and Gordon Lawrence, "Inservice Education: The State of the Art." Rethinking In-service Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975, p.9.
2. Tyler, R.W., "Inservice Education of Teachers: A Look at the Past and Future." Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. (Edited by L. J. Rubin) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
3. Edelfelt, R.A., op. cit., p. 16.
4. Goddu, Roland and others. "In-Service: The Professional Development of Educators," Journal of Teacher Education, XXVIII, No. 2 (March-April 1977) p. 24.
5. Burdin, Joel L., "The Doldrums in Teacher Education: In-Service Can Help," Journal of Teacher Education, XXVIII, No. 2 (March-April 1977) p.2.
6. Hermanowicz, Henry J., "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers," The World of Beginning Teachers, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 16-25.
7. Schild, Robert J., "A Study of Certain Practices and Some Proposed Directions for In-Service Education Programs in Selected Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964, Dissertation Abstracts, Nov. 1964.

8. Pederson, Joe F., "An Assessment of Vocational Teachers' Needs for In-Service Education in Region Nine of Kentucky, With Recommendations for Meeting Those Needs," umpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1973, Dissertation Abstracts, April 1974.

9. Texas Education Agency, Division of Evaluation, Inservice Training - A Summary of Opinion, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1974.

INSERVICE EDUCATION IN TEXAS: THE STATE OF THE SCENE

In the fall of 1978 a survey of selected secondary school teachers and principals was conducted in Texas. The purpose of the survey was to try to determine the attitudes of the two groups (secondary school teachers and secondary principals) toward inservice programs in their schools. A variation in school size was intentional, as well as was geographic location, and urban and rural districts. With the desire to survey most school types, the questionnaires were mailed to 200 secondary school principals (grades 6-12) and 1,000 secondary school teachers. There were 120 principals who returned the instrument (60%) and 518 teachers (51.8%).

On March 11, 1978, the State Board of Education adopted Policy 4104 relating to inservice education and preparation days for state schools. As designated by the policy, not more than 3 days may be used for preparation days and 5 for inservice education. When college and university personnel visit the public schools for various reasons, they hear remarks from teachers and principals similar to this: "We are having another one of those dumb old inservice days today." Hence, the survey was made to discover attitudes from all quarters regarding inservice education (ISE).

Effective ISE programs should help teachers meet their changing needs and should serve as a continuing self-renewal source. If this does not happen, teachers may feel ISE programs to be irrelevant and a waste of time. So, what is the attitude of inservice teachers and principals toward ISE at this time?

Some specific objectives for the study were:

1. To determine how secondary school teachers feel toward ISE programs in the state.
2. To determine how secondary school principals in Texas feel toward ISE programs in their schools.
3. To compare the attitudes of the two groups toward ISE.
4. To compare the 1976 study with this one (1978).
5. To suggest possible improvements in the present system.

RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE

The successful development and implementation of new school programs require a positive attitude toward change on the part of those who are involved. It follows that if a teacher and/or principal feel negatively toward procedures utilized in planning and organizing ISE programs, the effectiveness of the results of the program are handicapped. Many new school programs are likely to fail because of the procedures utilized by the schools through ISE programs.

Research indicates that people react to change and innovation in regard to how they feel toward them to a greater degree than to what they know about them. A major singificance to this project will be to identify selected practices utilized by schools which are rated by their teachers and principals positively, as opposed to negatively. When these positive traits are identified, recommendations for change in a positive direction may be made.

SUMMARY OF DATA

Of the 638 educators responding to the survey instrument, 57.2 per cent were in schools with the ADA of between 1,000 and 9,999, with 25 per cent from

schools with an ADA of less than 1,000 and 13.9 per cent from schools with an ADA of 10,000 and above (See Table I).

There were a total of 7.4 per cent of the two groups who rated their ISE programs as Excellent, 52.5 per cent rated them as Good, 34.2 per cent as Fair, while 4.9 per cent felt their ISE programs were Poor. (See Table II). Who should plan ISE programs received the following ratings; 4.75 per cent felt administrators should plan, 7.4 per cent felt teachers should, 85.2 per cent felt teachers and administrators should jointly do the planning, while 2.6 per cent had other suggestions. In response to the question, "Who should evaluate the ISE programs?" the following ratings were given; 1.75 per cent wanted administrators to do the job, 20.4 per cent wanted teachers, 75.7 per cent wanted them to do it jointly, and 2.1 per cent had other suggestions (See Tables III and IV).

Scheduling of time for various ISE meetings was important. Of the two groups of educators surveyed, 91 per cent recommended to spend from 0-19 per cent of ISE time in district meetings, 6.5 per cent wanted to spend from 20-39 per cent of the time the same way. It was recommended that 0-19 per cent of the time should be allotted for building level meetings by 70.2 per cent of the respondants, while 24.4 per cent wanted to spend from 20-39 per cent of the time in this manner. It was recommended that 0-19 per cent time should be spent in subject area meetings by 40.85 per cent of the educators, 36.2 per cent voted for 20-39 per cent, while 19.4 per cent wanted 40-59 per cent of the time spent in this way. Ninety-six per cent of the respondants wanted to allot 0-19 per cent of ISE time to other school visitation, while 2.4 per cent wanted to devote 20-39 per cent to this activity. Teachers working in their own classrooms from 0-19

per cent of the time received 38.4 per cent of the votes, from 20-39 per cent received 29 per cent, 40-59 per cent received 22.1 per cent of the votes while 8.2 per cent wanted to spend 60-79 per cent of their time in this manner (See Table V).

From a list of possible topics for ISE study, the following topics received the most response:

A.	Classroom Discipline	Greatly needed - 30.5%	Needed - 55.5%
B.	Methods of Teaching	Greatly needed - 29.8%	Needed - 58.5%
C.	Motivating the Students	Greatly needed - 57.7%	Needed - 37.7%
D.	Use of Audio Visuals	Needed - 59.6%	Not needed - 28.5%
E.	Classroom Test Preparation	Needed - 47.7%	Not needed - 39.1%
F.	Assigning Student Grades	Needed - 47.0%	Not needed - 40.3%
G.	Use of Teacher Aids	Needed - 43.9%	Not needed - 41.5%
H.	Innovations	Greatly needed - 15.9%	Needed - 60.7% Not needed - 18.1%
I.	Individualizing Instruction	Greatly needed - 24.8%	Needed - 58.1% Not needed - 13.9%
J.	Teacher Self-Improvement	Greatly needed - 26.9%	Needed - 62.9% Not needed - 9.3%
K.	Drug Education	Needed - 57.0%	Not needed - 27.3%
L.	Career Education	Greatly needed - 15%	Needed - 60.4% Not needed - 18.1%
M.	Bilingual Education	Needed - 29.1%	Not needed - 57.7%

(See Table VI)

Scheduling times of the year for ISE study was our seventh question. On a scale of 1-6 (1 being most desirable and 6 being least desirable) the following ratings were given.

A. Before the opening of the school year - 62.6% marked 1 with 20.4% marking 2.

B. At the end of the school year - 15.6% marked 3, 17.5% marked 4, 41.7% marked 6.

C. After the school day - 19.0% marked 4, 31.4% marked 5, 32.1% marked 6.

D. Before school in the morning - 21.7% marked 4, 25% marked 5, 32.6% marked 6.

E. Faculty Retreats - 27.5% marked 3, 20% marked 4, 21% marked 6.

F. Entire day distributed throughout the year - 37.8% marked 1, 41.9% marked 2 11.1% marked 3.

(See Table VII)

The attitudes of teachers and principals toward specific program requirements and considerations is given in Table VIII. The following list is a summary of the table.

A. New teacher orientation - 79.5% agreed on this item

B. Individual interests of teachers - 80.1% agreed

C. Strengthen the profession - 82.9% agreed

D. Upgrading teacher profession - 78.6% agreed, 6.1% neutral, 4.7% disagreed

E. There is greater teacher commitment when teachers are included in the planning - 73.3% agreed, 14.8% neutral

F. Attendance should be required - 59.5% agreed, 13.0 neutral, 16.7% disagreed

G. Innovations studied should be supported by the administration - 68.8% agreed, 15.6% were neutral

H. ISE programs should arise from a study of the needs of teachers - 84.7% agreed

I. Effectiveness of an ISE program be determined by a follow-up study - 78.1% agreed, while 9.4% were neutral

TABLE I

District Size

	1976		1978	
	%P	%T	%P	%T
Less than 1,000 ADA	50.1	1.9	33.3	17.8
1,000 - 9,999 ADA	28.3	10.2	59.2	55.2
10,000 ADA and above	21.7	87.9	6.7	21.2
	N=46	N=108	N=120	N=518

TABLE II

Inservice Programs Rated

	1976		1978	
	%P	%T	%P	%T
Excellent	4.0	1.3	9.2	5.6
Good	61.1	24.0	59.2	45.2
Fair	33.2	44.1	29.2	39.2
Poor	4.1	28.2	0.8	9.1

TABLE III

Who Should Plan ISE

	1976		1978	
	%P	%T	%P	%T
Administrators	13.0	8.0	5.8	3.7
Teachers	2.1	11.2	4.2	10.6
Administrators & Teachers	78.0	65.1	87.5	83.0
Other Suggestions	7.2	11.0	2.5	2.7
	N=46	N=108	N=120	N=518

TABLE IV

Who Should Evaluate ISE

	1976		1978	
	%P	%T	%P	%T
Administrators			2.5	1.1
Teachers			12.5	28.2
Administrators & Teachers	87.4	58.5	82.5	68.9
Other Suggestions			2.5	1.7

TABLE V

Types of Meetings

a. 0- 19%
b. 20- 39%
c. 40- 59%
d. 60- 79%
e. 80-100%

	1978 %P	1978 %T
1. District Meetings	*a. - 90%	*a. - 92%
	b. - 7.5%	b. - 5.6%
2. Building Meetings	a. - 59.2	*a. - 81.3
	*b. - 34.2	b. - 14.7
3. Subject Area	a. - 40.8	a. - 40.9
	*b. - 35.8	*b. - 36.7
	c. - 20.0	c. - 18.9
4. Visit Other Schools	*a. - 96.7	*a. - 95.6
	b. - 1.7	b. - 3.1
5. Work in Classrooms	a. - 52.5	a. - 24.3
	*b. - 24.2	b. - 33.8
	c. - 16.7	*c. - 27.6
	d. - 5.0	d. - 11.4
	e. - 1.7	e. - 2.1

* Indicates the preference of the majority of the 1976 study

TABLE VI

Topics for Study

		1978	
		%P	%T
a. Greatly needed	1. Classroom discipline	a. 32.5	28.6
b. Needed		b. 54.2	56.8
c. Not needed		c. 9.2	14.1
	2. Methods of teaching	a. 35.8	23.9
		b. *55.8	*61.2
		c. 4.2	13.9
	3. Motivating the students	a. *66.7	*48.8
		b. 30.0	45.4
		c. 2.5	4.1
	4. Use of audio-visuals	a. 10.8	7.7
		b. 57.5	61.8
		c. 27.5	29.5
	5. Teacher made tests	a. 9.2	4.8
		b. 50.8	44.6
		c. 28.3	50.0
	6. Assigning student grades	a. 10.8	6.0
		b. 50.8	43.2
		c. 30.8	49.8

TABLE VI
(cont.)

a. Greatly needed
b. Needed
c. Not needed

7.	Use of teacher aides	a. 7.5	10.2
		b. 41.7	46.1
		c. 40.8	42.3
8.	Innovations (teaming, non-grading)	a. 10.0	21.8
		b. 63.3	58.1
		c. 17.5	18.7
9.	Individualizing instruction	a. 29.2	20.5
		b. 55.0	*61.2
		c. 10.8	17.0
10.	Teacher self-improvement	a. 38.3	15.6
		b. *55.0	70.8
		c. 5.8	12.9
11.	Drug education	a. 3.3	14.9
		b. 56.7	58.1
		c. 29.2	25.5
12.	Career education	a. 10.8	20.8
		b. 62.5	58.3
		c. 17.5	18.9
13.	Bilingual education	a. 1.7	3.9
		b. 21.7	36.5
		c. 59.2	56.2

TABLE VII

Scheduling ISE Programs

		1978 %P	1978 %T
A. Before the school year	1.	*68.3	*56.9
	2.	15.0	25.9
B. At the end of school year	4.	15.0	20.1
	5.	*14.2	12.5
	6.	47.5	*35.9
C. After the school day	4.	20.3	18.1
	5.	*33.3	*29.9
	6.	28.3	34.6
D. Before school in the morning	4.	25.0	18.5
	5.	25.0	25.5
	6.	*29.2	*36.1
E. Faculty retreats	1.	8.3	7.9
	2.	13.3	12.5
	3.	*29.2	*25.9
	4.	20.8	19.3
	5.	6.7	10.4
	6.	20.0	22.0
F. Entire day throughout year	1.	30.8	*44.8
	2.	*48.3	35.5
	3.	10.8	12.0

* 1976 study

most desirable 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. least desirable

TABLE VIII

Attitude Toward ISE Topics for Study

		1978 %P	1978 %T	Tennessee Teachers (1974)
a. Agree b. Neutral c. Disagree	1. New teacher orientation	a. 70.8	88.2	99.0%
		c. 5.8	7.1	2.0
	2. Teacher interests	a. 70.8	89.0	96.0
		b. 0.8	1.9	2.0
	3. Strengthen profession	a. 73.3	92.5	89.0
	4. Improve teacher performance	a. 72.5	84.7	90.0
	5. Teachers' involved in planning are more committed	a. 68.3	76.3	77.0
		b. 10.8	18.9	6.0
	6. Required attendance	a. 58.3	60.8	76.0
		b. 6.7	19.3	
		c. 14.2	19.1	12.0
	7. Administration should support innovations	a. 62.5	75.1	68.0
		b. 11.7	19.5	
		c. 5.0	4.8	7.0
	8. ISE grow out of a study of teacher needs	a. 73.3	96.1	34.0
		c. 1.7	0.8	45.0
	9. Effective follow-up study required	a. 72.5	83.8	13.3
		c. 3.3	1.9	65.0